

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action issued September 3, 2008, claims 1, 3-10, 12-16, 18-25, 27-31, 33-40, and 42-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,925,631 to Golden ("Golden") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,659 to Sarkar et al. ("Sarkar"), and further in view of Sijacic, U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0158832 ("Sijacic").

Claims 1, 4-10, 12-16, 19-25, 27-31, 34-40, and 42-51 are now pending in this application. Claims 3, 18, and 33 have been canceled. Claims 1, 16, and 31 have been amended in order to clarify the subject matter that the Applicant considers to be the invention and claims 4, 19, and 34 have been amended to correct dependencies. No new matter has been added.

The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 3-10, 12-16, 18-25, 27-31, 33-40, and 42-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golden in view of Sarkar and further in view of Sijacic, because even if Golden, Sarkar, and Sijacic were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the result still would not disclose or suggest the requirements of the claims.

For example, claims 1, 16, and 31 require introspecting an input class included in the archive file to automatically generate information relating to the input class by extracting information identifying methods included in the input class; and for each method, extracting information relating to parameters of the method including at least a name and a type of each parameter. As the Examiner indicates, Golden does not disclose this requirement. Likewise, Sijacic and the combination of Golden and Sijacic do not disclose this requirement. Rather, the Examiner cites Sarkar at col. 6, line 66 to col. 7,

line 4 as disclosing this requirement. However, as disclosed by Sarkar, JAVA class introspection is performed to retrieve the static variable of properties object C1 and obtain the name of the helper object it needs to instantiate which is based on the previously-set static variable. First, the introspection performed by Sarkar does not automatically generate information relating to an input class in an archive file, but rather obtains information for the helper object, which, as disclosed by Sarkar, is not part of the input class, but rather is part of an associated helper class (col. 6, lines 45-47). Thus, Sarkar does not disclose or suggest introspecting an input class included in the archive file to automatically generate information relating to the input class. Second, for this helper object, Sarkar only discloses retrieving the static variable of properties object C1 and obtaining the name of the helper object to instantiate to process object C1. This is different than the requirement of the claims to extracting information identifying methods included in the input class; and for each method, extracting information relating to parameters of the method including at least a name and a type of each parameter. Sarkar does not disclose or suggest extracting information identifying methods included in the input class because Sarkar only discloses identifying the name of the helper object, which, as disclosed by Sarkar, is not included in the input class. Further, Sarkar does not disclose or suggest extracting information relating to parameters of the method including at least a name and a type of each parameter because Sarkar discloses identifying the name of the helper object, which, as disclosed by Sarkar, is not included in the input class and further, is not a name or type of a parameter of a method, and because Sarkar discloses retrieving the static variable of properties object C1, which also is not included

in the input class, and in any case, is not a name or a type of a parameter of a method included in the input class.

As a result, the combination of Golden, Sarkar, and Sijacic does not disclose or suggest introspecting an input class included in the archive file to automatically generate information relating to the input class by extracting information identifying methods included in the input class; and for each method, extracting information relating to parameters of the method including at least a name and a type of each parameter.

Therefore, claim 1, and claims 16 and 31, which are similar to claim 1, and claims 4-10, 12-15, 19-25, 27-30, 34-40, and 42-51, which depend therefrom, are not unpatentable over Golden in view of Sarkar and further in view of Sijacic.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

**Additional Fees:**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 50-4545 (5231-087-US01).

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Michael A. Schwartz, #40,161/

Michael A. Schwartz  
Reg. No. 40,161

Dated: March 3, 2009

Hanify & King, P.C.  
1875 K Street, N.W., Suite 707  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 403-2100 Tel.  
(202) 429-4380 Fax